

# THE DEMOCRAT.

CANTON, MISS.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1842.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**JOHN C. CALHOUN,**  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

[Subject to the decision of a National Convention.]

"Nor is our Government to be maintained, or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States. In thus attempting to make our General Government strong, we make it weak. Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States, as much as possible, to themselves—in making itself felt, not in its power, but in its beneficence, not in its control, but in its protection, not in binding the States more closely to the centre, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit."—*Jackson.*

## MR. CLAY AND THE TARIFF.

In a former number of our paper we contrasted the principles of Mr. Clay with the professions of Southern Whigs of 1840, on the Tariff Question. We then attempted, we think successfully, to show that the Whigs of the South, cannot support Mr. Clay for the Presidency, without the grossest inconsistency and a palpable abandonment of the opinions professed by them in 1840, in relation to a protective tariff. We showed this by exhibiting Mr. Clay as a protective tariff man, and then by showing that the Whigs of 1840 professed to be opposed to a tariff of protection, they having even gone so far as to denounce Mr. Van Buren for admitting the power, though solemnly and fully pledged to go against the principle of protection. But the Mississippi Creole, through its late pro tem editor, has informed us, that a certain writer in that paper over the signature of "Candour" has "blown our charge to the winds." But *quo modo?* Let us see how he has done so. Now, it is plain that if the opinions of Mr. Clay, and the professions of the Whigs of '40 were correctly stated by us, then the charge of inconsistency and of abandonment of principle as made by us, is necessarily established. Well, it is not even pretended that the Whig professions have been incorrectly stated; what we said of them may therefore be considered as granted. If our other proposition, to-wit, that Mr. Clay is a protective tariff man, be true, then it follows, that our charge, instead of being "blown to the winds," is fully established. Well, is it not true? Verily, it is proven, as broadly as we asserted, by Mr. Clay's own declarations, extracted from his speeches, and set forth in the communication in the Creole, that he is a protective tariff man. This was all we charged against him.

Candour's *cacoethes scribendi* led him to review our article. He could not deny the truth of our propositions, or avoid the conclusions which we drew therefrom.—Yet he must say something by way of reply, and to give the appearance of speciousness to it, he wilfully misstates what we said. In pretending to state our propositions he says that we asserted that Mr. Clay is in favor of a "high protective tariff," and again he asks us how we can have the heart to attempt to prove Mr. Clay to be in favor of a "high protective tariff." In each instance the words *high protective tariff* are italicized, and marked with quotations, evidently for the purpose of leading his readers to suppose we had stated, and attempted to prove Mr. Clay a high protective tariff man. But we stated no such thing; the words which Candour has taken the pains to italicize, and mark with quotations he cannot find in our article! We did not say Mr. Clay is in favor of a high protective tariff: to make out our charge it was not necessary for us to do so. It was sufficient for our purposes to show that he advocated the principle of protection and believed it constitutional. Whether Mr. Clay was in favor of pushing the protective policy to the extreme point, or of its exercise in comparative moderation, could in no wise affect our charge of inconsistency and abandonment of principle.

Having thus slyly, falsely and most unfairly misrepresented our proposition and argument, Candour proceeds to fight against the "gigantic illusion which his Quixotic imagination had conjured up," by attempting to show that Mr. Clay is not a high protective tariff man, and, to do this, he parades two extracts from Mr. Clay's speeches, delivered, one at Buffalo, in 1839 and the other in Senate of U. States, 1842, in the former of which Mr. Clay declares himself in favor of "reasonable and adequate protection," and in the latter of which he says: "I do not think an exorbitant or very high tariff necessary; but one that shall ensure adequate revenue and reasonable protection." Again he says: "I have ever believed that stability, with a moderate amount of protection, better than a very high tariff without."

Now, in all these extracts, the principle of protection is distinctly admitted. It was to this principle that the Whigs of 1840 professed to be opposed. They then advocated General Harrison's election because he was "with the South on the subject of the tariff, being in favor of the Compromise Bill, and of course opposed to the protective system;" because he was for limiting the rate of duties to 20 per cent. after 30th June, 1842, and thought that, after that time, duties should be laid for the purpose only of raising the revenue sufficient for the economical administration of the government, and without reference to protection, and, because, in his Zanesville letter, he said he was in favor of the compromise act, and never would "consent to its being altered or repealed." Now, how do Mr. Clay's principles agree with these professions? Instead of being in favor of the compromise, and unwilling to see it "altered or repealed," he, on the 15th day of February last, introduced a series of resolutions in the Senate, declaring "that the rate of duties on foreign imports ought to be augmented beyond the rate of 20 per cent" as provided by the compromise.

Mr. Clay has ever been a protective tariff man. His very first speech upon taking his seat a second time, in the Senate of the U. States in the winter of 1809—10 was in favor of the protective system. So says his biographer, Mr. Prentice, on the 48th page of his book. The subject was again brought before Congress in the session of 1815-16 and Mr. Prentice in his book, page 179, in speaking of Mr. Clay's views thereon, at that time, uses the following language: "Probably the name of Henry Clay is hardly ever mentioned at the present period, without suggesting, by an irresistible association, the American system for the protection of home industry—a system into which, like that of internal improvements, he breathed the breath of life, and which lived, and moved and had its being in his influence."

Mr. Clay took the leading part in establishing the protective tariff of 1824. It was at this period that he baptised it with the name of "American System." Niles' Register of that date styles him the "Ajax Telemon of the bill" of 1824. It is well known that the main apology he gave for voting against General Jackson and for J. Q. Adams, in 1824 was, that if the former was made President the hopes of the friends of the American System would be crushed. See Prentice biography, page 235. The convention at Philadelphia, which nominated Mr. Clay, on 11th Sept. 1824 adopted the following resolution: "Resolved, That we will use all honorable means to procure the election of Henry Clay, the great champion of the American System."

In a speech in Philadelphia on 19th June, 1827, Mr. Clay thus speaks of the constitutionality of protection which the whigs of 1840, so much abused Mr. Van Buren for admitting:

"From the very commencement of the government, and throughout all the stages of its existence, in peace and in war, the power has been asserted and exercised. It is delegated by more than one clause in the constitution."

In the same speech Mr. Clay says the protective system is "sustained by the experience of all countries, and especially that from which we sprang." Verily it is sustained by the experience of England with a vengeance. It has impoverished her people and enriched her nobility. It has her seat many an honest subject suppers to bed, from inability to buy bread stuffs upon which the policy of the government has placed a tariff of 300 per cent! It has occasioned riots and disorder among the laboring classes, which it is necessary to keep a standing army to keep quiet! Emaciated poverty and even death, among the great multitude there, is the experimental result of that policy which in England seeks to protect the wealthy lords amongst whom all the lands of the country are distributed, by increasing the value of those lands and the products thereof, through the means of such tariffs on imported articles of food, principally bread, as will enable the land holders to sell the products of their lordly domains, at a rate ruinous to the consumers, the vastly greater portion of the people.—Yet, it is this system of inexorable cruelty, oppression and injustice that Mr. Clay thinks is sanctioned by the experience of England! It is this system of policy—the policy of making the rich richer and the poor poorer—of suiting government to the wants of the few and not of the many—of adding to the wealth of a few northern manufacturing capitalists, at the expense of all other interests—that Mr. Clay would like to put, as a filthy patch, upon our national escutcheon.

Let us trace Mr. Clay's views a little further on this question. In December, 1832, he addressed the manufacturers at Philadelphia. In his speech he said:

"The American System, as a course of policy, is the only one to produce real prosperity, happiness and respectability;

may the only system which can secure the Union. He should be the last man, he assured them, to abandon that system."

The only system that can secure the Union! Verily it is the system, and the only system that ever seriously threatened a dissolution of the Union. The tariff of 1828, the bill of abominations, did almost dissolve the Union. The South petitioned and remonstrated against the system—she threw the Constitution into the scale, yet it still remained against us, till South Carolina, like the noble Gaul, "flung her sword into the scale." Then followed the compromise, by which the South agreed to submit, for ten years, till 30th June, 1842, to the tariff for the benefit of factories, upon the promise and assurance that after that time taxes should be laid for revenue only, that minimum rates and specific duties should be done away with. In this way the complaints of the South were hushed and public quiet restored. Mr. Clay was every where lauded as the "great pacificator." It was then, and not till then, that a voice was heard, in the South, to speak his praise. It was thought he had abandoned the protective system, by the compromise—but on the contrary on this subject he only "kept the word of promise to the ear" while he "broke it to our hope" of the South. He declared to Mr. Appleton and other manufacturers, before the passage of the compromise bill, that he thought the protective system was in danger, and he thought they had better compromise—"not to give up the protective policy, but to prevent its overthrow." See the speech of Mr. Appleton, (one of Mr. Clay's strongest friends,) made at the last session of Congress. In a speech of Mr. Clay in the Senate, after the compromise he said:

"The manufacturers would still grow and prosper, confident that the abandonment of protection was never intended, and looking to more favorable times for the renewal of a more efficient tariff."

This tariff "more efficient" than the tariff of 1828, which was abandoned by the compromise, was secured to the manufacturers at the last session.

Again, and afterwards, Mr. Clay speaking of the protective system said:

"He has cherished this system as a favorite child, and he still clung to it, and should cling to it. He wished to save and cherish it—he wished to see the whole system placed on a securer basis."

And again, in the Senate, in 1837, Mr. Clay said:

"For the double purpose of saving the protective policy from destruction, and saving the Union from the horrors of civil war, I brought forward the compromise act," &c.

In the same place, in 1838, Mr. Clay said:

"There is protection from one end to the other in the compromise act—modified and limited it is true—but protection nevertheless. There is adequate, abundant protection until 1842, and protection indefinitely beyond it."

"I saw that the great manufacturing interest had so got in the power of the Chief Magistrate (General Jackson), that it was evident that, at the next session of Congress, the whole protective system would be swept by the board. I therefore desired to give it, at least, a lease of years; and, for that purpose, I, in concert with others, brought forward the compromise measure, which was necessary to save that interest from total annihilation."

And again, in the Senate in 1840, he said:

"The policy of protecting the productions of American manufacturers should be adhered to and maintained."

That Mr. Clay has been true to his promise, not to abandon the protective system, we have before shown by reference to his resolution introduced into the Senate last winter, to destroy the compromise by fixing the rate of duty higher than that act provided for. Since Mr. Clay left the Senate, and but two short months after the principles of the compromise act had gone into full operation, that act was repealed, and a tariff of protection substituted in its place. Mr. Clay has fully approved of this act, in his speech at Dayton, and more recently in his speech in Indiana, he said he was "for a tariff for revenue to the government, and protection to manufacturers."

It is really idle to multiply evidences of Mr. Clay's views on this subject. No fair and candid man will deny, or ask for proof, that he is wedded to the protective tariff system. He is the champion of the Northern protective tariffs. His name is associated there with the system in all their presses, and at all their public meetings and tariff celebrations. It is idle for the whigs, in the coming contest, to attempt to practice the "sin of double-dealing,"—the sin that brought Charles 1st. to the block," by representing Mr. Clay with one set of principles for the North, and another for the South, as was done of their candidate in the last election.

But the most unfair, disingenuous, and dishonorable part of Candour's piece, is contained in the insinuation that Mr. Calhoun favored protection at the last session

of Congress. He asks us if Mr. Calhoun did not vote during the last Congress for "protection by duties varying from twenty to forty per cent. to the manufacturer?"—We answer No! The insinuation is as false as the heart could make it, after all that Mr. Calhoun has done "to eradicate every vestige of the protective principle," after the stand he took against it in the days of nullification, and especially after the long and able speeches he made during the last session of Congress against protection in every shape. Yet, the obliquity of Candour's moral and perceptive powers is so great, that he has the effrontery to associate Mr. Calhoun's name, with the system falsely called protective! Why, Mezentius, himself, when he linked the living with the dead, did not form a union more totally repugnant to the sense and sensibility of man, than the connexion of Mr. Calhoun's name with the policy of protection, in any degree, would be perfectly irreconcilable with justice, with truth, with fact. A man might with as much propriety, say that George Washington was a traitor in the revolution. Mr. Calhoun did not vote at the last session of Congress, for duties varying from 20 to 40 per cent. to afford protection to manufacturers; as is falsely stated. There is no semblance of truth in the assertion, although Mr. Candour has been at so much pains to underscraw and mark with quotation marks, the question which he asked us, thereby attempting to make the public believe he was quoting Mr. Calhoun's language. Mr. Calhoun voted for Mr. Merriam's and Mr. Sevier's bill, neither of which, however, was a bill to "afford protection varying from 20 to 40 per cent. to the manufacturers." He said at the time that he voted for them, that he did so, "not that he was prepared to adopt them, as they were moved; but because he regarded them as being intended for revenue and not for protection, and believed them susceptible of being made the basis of a bill calculated to meet the exigencies of the treasury, &c."

Such is the manner in which our charge has been blown to the winds. By unfair denials, and calls for proof of what ought in candor to be admitted—by falsely and purposely mis-stating our arguments, and misrepresenting the views of those whose principles we advocate, while at the same time, by using quotation marks, &c., he pretends to great particularity and faithfulness, Candour has convicted himself at least, of "an abandonment of every thing like principle." And we would, in conclusion, advise our editorial neighbors, and especially the pro tem, (if ever he should be such again,) to scan well the communications coming from the same source, if they do not wish their paper to become the vehicle to the public, of the grossest fraud, falsehood and injustice.

\* In the Senate, in 1838, Mr. Clay said it was Mr. Calhoun's aim "to eradicate every vestige of the protective system from our national code."

## HIGHLY IMPORTANT DECISION IN BANKRUPTCY.

Judge Story has recently made another highly interesting decision in Bankruptcy. The case was this. One Brown filed his petition on 2nd of February last, and was declared a Bankrupt on 3rd of May.—Immediately, on the 20th of February, the Bankrupt's mother died intestate, leaving about \$1000, and only two heirs, of which the Bankrupt was one. It was in proof, also, that Bankrupt was indebted to his mother in her lifetime \$1200.

After the most mature consideration, the Judge held,

1st, That the assignee was entitled to the Bankrupt's distributive share of his mother's estate, for the benefit of the Bankrupt's creditors, and

2ndly, That the administrator of the mother's estate, was entitled to deduct the Bankrupt's debts from the claim of the assignee, for the Bankrupt's share of the inheritance.

This decision is adverse to the opinion before prevalent, that after filing a petition to be declared a Bankrupt, and at any time before the decree of Bankruptcy, the petitioner may acquire property which will not be subject to his debts. By this opinion, all the Bankrupt's property, at the time of the decree of Bankruptcy, must go to pay his debts.

## ELECTIONS.

GEORGIA.—The final and full returns from this State have been received. They show an average democratic majority of 2271 votes.

OHIO.—The returns from Ohio are not yet full. The majority for Shannon, Dem., is so far, 3,536. The remaining counties to be heard from are five in number, and in 1840 gave Shannon a majority of 368. The Senate consists of 22 dem. and 14 whigs; the House consists of 41 dem. and 31 whigs. Democratic majority on joint ballot, 18.

PENNSYLVANIA.—We have now full returns from this State. The vote in the Senate stands 19 dem. and 14 whigs; in the House 62 dem. 38 whigs—Democratic majority on joint ballot 29.

Ex-governor Joseph Desha, of Kentucky, died at Georgetown, on 13th October.

The Creole of this morning rejoices much at what it pretends to think is a prospect of a division among the democrats as to who shall be their candidate for the Presidency. Such hopes naturally enough suggest themselves to the whigs after their late inglorious defeats all over the Union. Prepared now to give up if the contest shall be equal, and there is no division in our ranks, they have begun to cast about them eagerly and earnestly, for the signs of such division, well knowing that therein is their only remaining hope.—While we assure our whig friends, that we democrats feel no alarm on this subject, we would advise them to "take the beam out of their own eye" before they offer us their gratuitous counsel.—They will have enough to do at home to reconcile the differences between the friends of Clay, Scott, Webster &c. without intermeddling with ours.

The editor of the Creole is satisfied that Mr. Calhoun will not submit his claims to the decision of a National Convention, and gives as a reason, that the Edgefield Advertiser hoists the name of Mr. Calhoun for the Presidency, "not subject to the action of any convention." Now instead of publishing such as the evidence of the feeling of Mr. Calhoun's neighbors and friends in reference to his nomination, why did not the Creole publish the proceedings of the Democratic State Convention held recently in Charleston, at which resolutions were passed which expressed a preference for Mr. Calhoun, but at the same time highly complimented Mr. Van Buren, and solemnly and cheerfully agreed to submit Mr. Calhoun's claims to a National Convention.

Another ground stated by the Creole for its hope that our party will be divided is, that the Globe attacks "the Treaty, and thus attacks Mr. Calhoun" who voted for the Treaty. The conclusion illogically adopted by the Creole, does not follow from his premises. But the Globe has spoken in reply to the charges which the Creole so exultingly copies from the Madisonian, in relation to its feelings for Mr. Calhoun.—It says:

If we desired to assail Mr. CALHOUN, no one, we think, should suspect us of the folly of selecting a subject on which he was sustained by Mr. WRIGHT, Colonel KING, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WOODBURY—in a word, a majority of the Democratic party in the Senate. It is a new way to weaken a man, by driving a majority to support him. The truth is—obvious to all who care to see it—we have assailed no Senator who has assented to the treaty; on the contrary, we have defended them. We have assailed only the treaty, and those who made it. We can very well see how Senators might be bound in duty to assent to a treaty which they never would have made.

As to Mr. CALHOUN, we think that our paper has long since shown that, with us, "by-gones are by-gones." We did, in former times, say some pretty hard things of him; and, we are afraid, in return, as hard things were said of us. But we have long since set down in the same council-house, and smoked the calumet together. Our war-hatchets are unburied, only to wet them to the eyes in the blood of our common enemies; and should a national convention appoint him our great chief, we will follow his war-path, and fight in his shade, as long as a foe to the great Democratic tribe remains to darken our skies with the smoke of his wigwag, or leave his track upon the leaves of our hunting-ground.

From the last news, brought over from Europe, by the ships Independence and Britannia, it appears that the new tariff of this country is highly complained of in Europe and esteemed virtually prohibitory.—As some evidence of its effects, we publish the following extracts, copied by the Charleston Courier, from letters received at that port, from Europe.

Liverpool, Sept. 30.  
The new tariff is a source of deep regret here, as it frustrates hopes of an extensive and advantageous intercourse. In this country it is of less importance than to France and the rest of Europe; our direct and legitimate trade will of course suffer, while the indirect trade through Canada will no doubt flourish in rank vigour.

HAVRE, Oct. 1. On the receipt at Bordeaux, of the passage of the new tariff, the American ship S-s-a, loading for the U. States reloaded her cargo, the shippers paying half freight as forfeit.

Mr. Clay is said to be so much chagrined at his defeat in Ohio, that he has determined to decline all future invitations to attend barbecues.

A most destructive fire has occurred in Liverpool.—The Broker's returns of 24th Sept. show that 37,474 bales of cotton have been consumed.—The captain of the ship Independence, which sailed from Liverpool a day later, reports that the loss of cotton was then set down at 60,000 bales. It had the effect to raise the price of cotton from 4 pence to 4 pence, but the demand soon died away and the advance was not maintained.

## MR. JEFFERSON'S OPINION OF MR. CLAY.

Mr. Jefferson said of Mr. Clay, that he was "merely a splendid orator, without any valuable knowledge from experience or study, or any determined public principles founded on political science, either practical or theoretical."

## SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

We, as well as many of our friends hereabouts, subscribed for this periodical, and paid therefor \$10 in advance, in the confidence that the editor would be prompt to comply with his contract to furnish the numbers regularly. In this, however, we have been deceived. We have received only the first two numbers, and many of our friends have told us that they have received the same only. In fact, we believe there has been only one instance in which the third number has been received, and beyond the third number, not one has come, we believe, to this Post Office. The public prints inform us that the editorial chair has been removed to Charleston, and that the work is published regularly, at the price of \$5 only, to those who subscribe now. We think Mr. Whitaker might afford to send his Journal to us hereabouts, who subscribed for it, and paid him double price in advance. At all events, we, as well as our neighbor, would be glad, either to have back the money which we have paid, or to receive the consideration for it. We wrote to Mr. Whitaker to this effect, but he neither refunds the money, nor sends his work.

The whole number of applicants in this State for the Bankrupt Law are 1074.—Of these 584 reside in the Southern Judicial District and 490 in the Northern.

The Alabama, Tribune states that Miss Martineau, of England, "has declined a proffered pension of \$800 per annum, on the ground that the Premier has no right to bestow the public money at his pleasure, especially when the people are in such a suffering condition."

## THE SATURDAY COURIER.

To those who wish an instructive and interesting family paper, neutral in politics, we would recommend the Saturday Courier, published in Philadelphia. The Courier is a paper of the largest size, and filled, almost entirely, with reading matter on the various subjects of Science, Literature, Mechanics, Agriculture, &c. Price, \$3 per annum, and \$2 if paid in advance.

The Hon. Caleb Cushing addressed the people at Lowell on the 11th October.—We make the following extracts from his speech. The extracts embrace Mr. Cushing's views on the Bank question and on the proposed amendments of the Constitution in relation to the veto power. On both these questions he speaks boldly and eloquently. Hear him:

"Gentlemen, there is one other question yet undisturbed to which the attention of Congress, as well as of the Executive, has been called—that of a fixed currency. This question is not settled—and why? There are but three forms in which it has been proposed to be concluded—a United States Bank—an Independent Treasury, as it is called, and an Exchequer, as proposed by the present Administration. I may assume it as a fact, undeniable, that there is a fixed majority of the people adverse to the incorporation of a United States Bank, (cheers,) or any chartered company which should have the power to discount funds. If I entertained a doubt upon this point, which I do not—if I thought it possible to be mistaken in this position—I would gladly poll the House here upon the subject. I would ask how many here are ready to enter into a severe contest for the purpose of incorporating a United States Bank. I know that no such opinions exist—I know that you desire no longer to be wedded to a United States Bank."

I have ceased to believe that such a bank was the best means of conducting, and regulating the currency and exchange. I never entertained any affection for it, and those who have represented me as holding such an opinion, have been utterly mistaken. At the first Congress of which I was a member, I stated my course fairly—I avowed that I would be bound no longer in Mezenian bonds to the dead body of the United States Bank. It is true I voted for the bill drafted by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ewing. And the one or two votes like that which, on looking back, I most regret, were those which I gave only out of extreme anxiety to act with the Whig members of Congress. If I have erred, my sin has been, not of factious opposition, but of conceding too much to a love of peace. In the words of Mr. Webster; the man who entertains the scheme of a United States Bank, "pursues an obsolete idea." But are there no other means of attaining the end? Suppose a Bank of the United States were established, with a branch in Boston. How many of you would get discounts or derive any benefit from that branch? Not the mechanics—not the industrious classes—but only the great capitalists of Boston, as heretofore, and to the great body of the people it would be of no benefit whatever.

Well, gentlemen, what do you want of a United States Bank? You do not need it as a means of borrowing money; but your want is of a national currency, more convenient, perhaps more abundant, but as safe as gold and silver: something about which there is an "odor of nationality"—a universally valuable paper currency. And this is all that any rational man can desire. But you know there are great questions of constitutionality connected with this matter. The question of a bank has been driven three times head foremost butt against successive vetoes; its very friends have done all that in them lay, to render it an impossibility, and to render impossi-